

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00117 162057Z

67

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 014034

P 162015Z OCT 74

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2356

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0117

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, OCTOBER 15 AND 16, 1974

(SALT TWO-474)

1. AGGREGATE LIMITS: SHCHUKIN ASKED MAY (A-650) COULD NOT OVER-ALL EQUIVALENCE ALSO BE OBTAINED WITH DIFFERING TOTALS OF BOMBERS AND MISSILES FOR THE TWO SIDES, WITH OTHER LIMITS SUCH AS MIRV'S ALSO BEING DIFFERENT, IN SUCH A WAY THAT DIFFERENCES IN THE VARIOUS NUMBERS WOULD COMPENSATE. MAY ANSWERED THAT U.S. WOULD BE QUITE INTERESTED IN ANY PROPOSAL WHICH SOVIET SIDE WOULD MADE REGARDING HOW EQUIVALENCE COULD BE PROVIDED FOR IN AGREEMENT. NEXT DAY IN RESPONSE TO MAY'S QUESTION ON SOVIET IDEAS RE PROVIDING FOR EQUIVALENCE (A-651) SHCHUKIN SAID ONE WAY WOULD BE TO HAVE UNEQUAL AGGREGATE LEVELS FAVORING ONE SIDE AND UNEQUAL LEVELS OF MIRV'ED MISSILES FAVORING OTHER SIDE.

2. F.B.S.: BELETSKY ASKED ROWNY (A-655) IF HE HAD DETECTED SOVIET SHIFTS IN APPROACH ON FBS. BELETSKY SAID FIRST SHIFT WAS THAT THEY WERE NO LONGER PUTTING AS MUCH EMPHASIS AS PREVIOUSLY ON WITHDRAWAL; SECOND SHIFT WAS THAT OUR FBS WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00117 162057Z

INTO ACCOUNT IN ANY TOTALING OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS. HE

WISHED TO UNDERSCORE THAT THESE TWO POINTS WERE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. ROWNY SAID THAT BY THIS HE UNDERSTOOD THAT SOME COULD BE WITHDRAWN AND OTHERS COUNTED. BELETSKY NODDED AGREEMENT.

3. VERIFICATION: WHEN MAY ASIED WHAT SHCHUKIN'S SUGGESTION WAS FOR SOLVING PROBLEM OF VERIFYING MIRV'ED MISSILES SHCHUKIN REPLIED THAT IT RELIED ON A CERTAIN LIMITED AMOUNT OF TRUST BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES. ON U.S. SIDE, PROPORTION OF MISSILES ALREADY MIRV'ED WAS SO HIGH THAT IT DID NOT REALLY MATTER TO SOVIETS WHETHER OR NOT WE MIRV'ED ANY MORE MISSILES. ON SOVIET SIDE THIS WAS NOT EH CASE BUT IT SEEMED TO HIM "IMPOSSIBLE" THAT SOVIETS WOULD STOP THEIR MIRV DEPLOYMENT VERY MUCH SHORT OF U.S. AFTER THAT, IT WOULD NOT MATTER MUCH TO EITHER SIDE WHETHER MIRV LIMITS WERE STRICTLY ADHERED TO OR NOT. THEREFORE, WITH LIMITED AMOUNT OF MUTUAL TRUST, THE TWO SIDES MIGHT AGREE TO SOME MIRV LIMITATION DESPITE DIFFICULTIES OF VERIFICATION. HE ADDED THAT HE WAS THE ONLY ONE AMONG HIS DELEGATION TO ADMIT TO THESE DIFFICULTIES. THE OTHERS WOULD ASSERT THAT THEY CERTAINLY COULD VERIFY WHETHER A MISSILE WERE MIRV'ED OR NOT, ALTHOUGH THEY WOULD NEVER SAY HOW.

4. SHCHUKIN ALSO TOLD MAY (A-651) THAT INTERIM AGREEMENT PROVIDED A CONCEPTUAL RATHER THAT A LITERAL MODEL FOR TREATMENT OF MODERNIZATION AND VERIFICATION ISSUES WHICH WENT WITH MODERNIZATION. INTERIM AGREEMENT DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN HEAVY AND LIGHT MISSILES ON BASIS OF VISIBLE SILO DIMENSIONS. SIMILARLY, IN THE NEW AGREEMENT, WHATEVER QUALITATIVE RESTRICTIONS OR RESTRAINTS WOULD BE ESTABLISHED REGARDING NEW SYSTEMS, MODERNIZATION, OR MIRV'ING OF MISSILES MIGHT WELL BE STATED IN TERMS OF RESTRICTIONS ON OBSERVABLE QUANTITIES. FINDING SUITABLE OBSERVABLE MEASURES MIGHT BE DIFFICULT, BUT IT WOULD LEAD TO A PRACTICAL SOLUTION OF THE VERIFICATION PROBLEM. HE SAID AGAIN THAT, WHILE AGREEMENT SHOULD NOT BE BASED ON THE UNSUPPORTED WORD OF BOTH SIDES, NEVERTHELESS, SOME MEASURES OF GOOD FAITH ON EITHER SIDE SHOULD BE ASSUMED.

5. RESTRAINT: BELETSKY ASKED IF ROWNY (A-655) HAD CAUGHT NUANCES WHICH SOVIETS NOW ATTACHED TO CONCEPT ON RESTRAINT. ROWNY SAID THAT TO HIM THEIR CURRENT PROPOSALS FOCUSED ON EXERCISING RESTRAINT WHEREAS EARLIER ONES WOULD HAVE BANNED NEW
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00117 162057Z

SYSTEMS. BELETSKY SAID THESE NUANCES AMOUNTED TO A MAJOR SHIFT IN THEIR POSITION.

6. IN RESPONSE TO KLOSSON'S QUESTION (A-652) RE PHRASE "PLACING INTO SERVICE," CHULITSKY SAID SOVIETS DID NOT HAVE PRECISE STAGE IN MIND AND PREFERRED TO LEAVE THE PHRASE GENERAL AT PRESENT. KARPOV SAID SOVIETS SELECTED PHRASE BECAUSE IT WAS GENERAL IN NATURE AND THEY BELEIVED ACTUAL MEANING COULD BE NEGOTIATED.

7. IN RESPONSE TO MAY'S QUESTION (A-651) SHCHUKIN SAID DEPLOYMENT (RAZVERTIVANIYE) MEANT WEAPONS WERE EMPLACED IN THEIR MILITARY LOCATIONS; MAKING OPERATIONAL (VVOD V STROI) MEANT THE WEAPONS WERE OUT OF HAND OF CIVILIANS, ENGINEERS AND THE LIKE AND THE MILITARY HAD FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEM.

8. REDUCTIONS: KARPOV CONFIRMED TO KLOSSON (A-652) THAT SOVIET SIDE HAS MUTUAL REDUCTIONS IN MIND. HE SAID THAT REDUCTIONS AGREED UPON WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED DURING THE PERIOD OF AGREEMENT SINCE IT WOULD BE LOGICAL TO EXPECT THAT PROVISIONS FOR REDUCTIONS IN AN AGREEMENT WOULD HAVE TO TAKE PLACE DURING THE TIME THE AGREEMENT WAS IN EFFECT.

9. ROWNY ASKED BELETSKY (A-646) WHETHER SEMENOV'S REFERENCE TO "SOME REDUCTIONS" MEANT "MUTUAL" REDUCTIONS. BELETSKY SAID SEMENOV'S STATEMENT STOOD ON ITS OWN MERITS. THAT REDUCTIONS COULD BE ADDRESSED UNDER THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL SECURITY AND NO UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE. ROWNY PRESSED BELETSKY, WHO FINALLY SAID REDUCTIONS ON THEIR SIDE COULD BE CONSIDERED ONLY IF FBS, INCLUDING C.V.A. AND GEOGRAPHIC FACTORS, WERE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT; REDUCTIONS INVOLVING SIMPLE COMPARISONS BETWEEN THE THREE CENTRAL SYSTEMS ON BOTH SIDES WERE NOT PART OF THEIR FORMULATION. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETING REPORTS, SALT TWO-474
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: shawdg
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974SALTT00117
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740294-0781
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741044/aaaablfl.tel
Line Count: 138
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: shawdg
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17 JUN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <17 JUN 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <18 MAR 2003 by shawdg>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, OCTOBER 15 AND 16, 1974 (SALT TWO-474)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005